

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/646,100	CHOMINSKI, PAUL P.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Dean O Takaoka	2817	

All Participants:

 (1) Dean O Takaoka.

 (2) Roger W. Blakely, Jr..
Status of Application: ____

(3) ____

(4) ____

Date of Interview: 8 November 2004
Time: 1:00p
Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

5

Prior art documents discussed:

Goudie, Bahl

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner requested Applicant's invention further defined to overcome the prior art. The applicant suggested the additional limitation "comprising a 90 degree phase shifter" be added where Goudie was drawn merely to a common mode filter and where Bahl, although showing a phase coupler merely show four inductors and not a transformer. The Examiner agreed the proposed amendment's distinguish over the prior art of Goudie and Bahl. It was agreed that the changes would be made by Examiner's amendment in order to place the application in condition for allowance..